REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action issued on April 10, 2007. Applicants' representative would like to initially thank Examiners Borlinghaus and Patel for the courtesy they extended during the May 2, 2007 interview.

By the foregoing amendments, Applicants have amended Claim 1 along the lines discussed during the interview, and have amended several dependent claims. In addition, Applicants have canceled the non-elected claims, and have added several new dependent claims. No new matter has been added.

I. Rejection of Claims 10 and 11 under section 112, second paragraph

Applicants submit that the amendments made to Claims 10 and 11 overcome the rejections of these claims under section 112, second paragraph.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-13 under section 103 over Conklin in view of Gralla

Claims 1-13 stand rejected over Conklin in view of Gralla. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper because, among other reasons, Conklin and Gralla do not collectively teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 as amended herein.

For example, Conklin and Gralla do not teach or suggest the use of pay boxes that provide links from external web pages to payees' pay pages as recited in Claim 1. As discussed during the interview, Conklin's brief disclosure at column 22, lines 44-58 of two seller sites that are linked together does not suggest this feature. As another example, Conklin and Gralla do not collectively teach or suggest a "pay box generation module" that is "configured to generate, and output to a user, coding that is adapted to be incorporated into an external web page to cause the external web page to display a corresponding pay box."

Additional patentable distinctions over Conklin and Gralla are recited in the dependent claims. As one example, Conklin and Gralla do not suggest the following limitations added by Claim 3: "wherein the pay box generation module provides functionality for a payee to specify a payment amount associated with a pay box such that visitor selection of the pay box causes the payment amount to be displayed within a payment amount field of a corresponding pay page." The cited portion of Gralla, namely pages 126-133, simply does not suggest this feature.

As another example, Claim 7, as amended, recites a "module which provides functionality for third party users to locate and install pay boxes of other users, said functionality including a user interface that enables a third party to browse descriptions of payees having pay boxes that are available for syndication, and to select a particular pay box to install on an external web page. As discussed during the interview, none of the art of record suggests such a feature.

The foregoing are merely examples. Additional distinctions are recited in other dependent claims, including the new dependent claims added by this Amendment.

III.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments, remarks, and substance of interview, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which can potentially be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record at his direct dial number listed below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: May 18, 2007   By: /RJS38297/
                                                       Ronald J. Schoenbaum
                                                       Registration No. 38,297
                                                       Attorney of Record
                                                       Customer No. 20,995
                                                       (949) 760-0404